APPELLANT'S STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL FROM BANKRUPTCY COURT

Case 2:20-bk-21022-BR Doc 661 Filed 09/08/21 Entered 09/08/21 18:22:15 Desc

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	۱

25

26

27

28

On August 25, 2021, Party-in-Interest and Appellant Erika Girardi ("Ms. Girardi") filed a Notice of Appeal from the Memorandum of Decision and Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration, entered by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California in the above-captioned case on August 11, 2021 (Docket Nos. 571 and 572). In accordance with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 6(b)(2)(B), Ms. Girardi hereby designates the following issues for consideration on appeal.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- 1. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by denying Ms. Girardi's Motion for Reconsideration of the Order Granting Chapter 7 Trustee's Application to Employ the Law Offices of Ronald Richards & Associates, APC as Special Litigation Counsel (Dkt. No. 437) (the "Motion for Reconsideration"), even though new evidence discovered after entry of the Employment Order revealed that Ronald N. Richards, the principal of Ronald Richards & Associates, A.P.C. ("Mr. Richards"), made prejudicial and disparaging public statements about Ms. Girardi related to his investigation and the Trustee's alleged claims against her, in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 6068 and Rule 3.6 of the California Rules of Professional Conduct?
- 2. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by denying Ms. Girardi's Motion for Reconsideration even though new evidence discovered after entry of the Employment Order revealed that Mr. Richards made undisputed public statements on social media and in interviews that disparaged Ms. Girardi and her integrity and caused prejudice to her, including in connection with the adversary proceeding filed by Mr. Richards and the Trustee against Ms. Girardi on July 14, 2021?
- 3. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by denying Ms. Girardi's Motion for Reconsideration even though new evidence discovered after entry of the Employment Order revealed that Mr. Richards failed to comply with his disclosure obligations under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2014, by omitting his material connections to parties in interest based on his subsequently admitted extensive participation in the Hulu documentary about Girardi Keese, Mr. Girardi, and Ms. Girardi, "The Housewife and the Hustler," released on June 12, 2021?
- 4. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by denying Ms. Girardi's Motion for Reconsideration even though new evidence discovered after entry of the Employment Order revealed that Mr.

1

5

4

- 6 7
- 8 9
- 10 11
- 13

12

- 14 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20 21
- 22 23
- 24 25
- 26
- 27 28

- Richards violated Rule 4.2 of the California Rules of Professional Conduct by engaging directly with Ms. Girardi, a represented party, on social media regarding the merits of the pending adversary complaint against her?
- 5. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by failing to issue a narrow and constitutionally appropriate gag order in light of, among other evidence presented with the Motion for Reconsideration and Ms. Girardi's Reply papers, Mr. Richards's undisputed extra-judicial statements disparaging Ms. Girardi's credibility and integrity, Mr. Richards's public and direct engagement with Ms. Girardi (a represented party) on social media about the merits of the pending adversary complaint against her, and Mr. Richards's statement in his declaration filed with his opposition to the Motion for Reconsideration that he would not refrain from his extra-judicial statements absent an order from the Court?
- 6. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by finding that Mr. Richards had no conflicts of interest that would preclude his representation of the Chapter 7 Trustee as her Special Litigation Counsel?
- 7. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by concluding that "Mr. Richards' conduct failed to constitute any ethical violations that would disqualify him from representing the trustee as her special litigation counsel"?
- 8. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by failing to consider or address the actual substance of Mr. Richards's social media posts and extra-judicial statements about Ms. Girardi?
- 9. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by failing to address at all or give weight to the fact that as a matter of law, Mr. Richards, as counsel to a bankruptcy trustee, was an extension of the trustee and held to the same highest of fiduciary standards?
- 10. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by failing to consider, address, or give weight to the fact that Mr. Richards also abused his position as Special Litigation Counsel to the Trustee by publicly threatening with investigation individuals who appeared supportive of Ms. Girardi and may be potential witnesses?
- 11. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by failing to consider, address, or give weight to the fact that, following entry of the Employment Order, Mr. Richards continued unabated in his extra-

1

5

4

7

8

6

- 9 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 15

14

- 16 17
- 18

19

20

21

- 22
- 23 24

25

- 26 27
- 28

- judicial disparaging statements about Ms. Girardi, including in social media posts and interviews on YouTube and podcasts and by making reference to his new role as Special Litigation Counsel to the Trustee?
- 12. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by relying on and giving significant weight to the legally inaccurate and argumentative "expert" Declaration of Erin Joyce in opposition to the Motion for Reconsideration ("Joyce Declaration"), which purported to supplant the Court's role by opining on ultimate legal issues that were the province of the Court to decide?
- 13. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by failing to find that Mr. Richards's failure to disclose in his Employment Application his subsequently-admitted extensive participation in the Hulu documentary about Girardi Keese, Mr. Girardi, and Ms. Girardi, "The Housewife and the Hustler" (which the Court characterized as a "YouTube video")—which included one of the petitioning creditors in the bankruptcy case and conveyed a negative judgment toward Ms. Girardi—violated Rule 2014 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure?
- 14. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by relying on and giving weight to Mr. Richards's statement that "The Housewife and the Hustler" documentary did not air until after entry of the Employment Order and that his participation was minimal, even though Mr. Richards complained on social media on June 3, 2021—prior to entry of the Employment Order—that it was "unfair" that he was cut from the show because his "16 hours of footage with expert analysis" could not be replaced?
- 15. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by failing to give weight to the fact that Ms. Girardi, as a defendant in an adversary proceeding for fraudulent conveyance, has a right to a jury trial and that Mr. Richards's disparaging statements about her on social media and in interviews, including his practice of ending his tweets about her with "#girardifraud," only serve to prejudice any potential jury pool, which would result in depriving Ms. Girardi of her right to a fair trial?
- 16. Did the Bankruptcy Court err by finding that Ms. Girardi's legal argument that Mr. Richards's barrage of social media postings and public statements (and evidence regarding the same) would prejudice any potential jury pool lacked "any basis in fact or law as a ground for reconsideration" and was somehow improperly raised in the Motion for Reconsideration?

In re GIRARDI KEESE CACB Case No. 2:20-bk-21022-BR CACD Case No. 2:21-cv-06951-SVW

3

TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING:

45

The following is the list of **parties** who are currently on the list to receive email notice/service for this case.

6

• **Kyra E Andrassy** kandrassy@swelawfirm.com, lgarrett@swelawfirm.com;gcruz@swelawfirm.com;jchung@swelawfirm.com

7

• Rafey Balabanian rbalabanian@edelson.com, docket@edelson.com

8

Michelle Balady mb@bedfordlg.com, leo@bedfordlg.com

9

10

• Ori S Blumenfeld ori@marguliesfaithlaw.com, Helen@MarguliesFaithLaw.com;Angela@MarguliesFaithLaw.com;Vicky@MarguliesFait hLaw.com

11

• Evan C Borges eborges@ggtriallaw.com, cwinsten@ggtriallaw.com

12

• Richard D Buckley richard.buckley@arentfox.com

13

• Marie E Christiansen mchristiansen@vedderprice.com, ecfladocket@vedderprice.com,marie-christiansen-4166@ecf.pacerpro.com

15

14

• Jennifer Witherell Crastz jcrastz@hrhlaw.com

16

• **Ashleigh A Danker** Ashleigh.danker@dinsmore.com, SDCMLFiles@DINSMORE.COM;Katrice.ortiz@dinsmore.com

17 18

• Clifford S Davidson csdavidson@swlaw.com, jlanglois@swlaw.com;cliff-davidson-7586@ecf.pacerpro.com

19

• Lei Lei Wang Ekvall lekvall@swelawfirm.com, lgarrett@swelawfirm.com;gcruz@swelawfirm.com;jchung@swelawfirm.com

2021

• Richard W Esterkin richard.esterkin@morganlewis.com

22

• **Timothy W Evanston** tevanston@swelawfirm.com, gcruz@swelawfirm.com;lgarrett@swelawfirm.com;jchung@swelawfirm.com

23

• **Jeremy Faith** Jeremy@MarguliesFaithlaw.com, Helen@MarguliesFaithlaw.com;Angela@MarguliesFaithlaw.com;Vicky@MarguliesFaithlaw.com

2425

• James J Finsten , jimfinsten@hotmail.com

26

• Alan W Forsley alan.forsley@flpllp.com, awf@fkllawfirm.com,awf@fl-lawyers.net,addy.flores@flpllp.com

2728

• Eric D Goldberg eric.goldberg@dlapiper.com, eric-goldberg-1103@ecf.pacerpro.com

Cast	Main Document Page 9 of 10		
1	Ronald N Richards ron@ronaldrichards.com, morani@ronaldrichards.com		
2	Kevin C Ronk Kevin@portilloronk.com, Attorneys@portilloronk.com		
3	• Frank X Ruggier frank@ruggierlaw.com, enotice@pricelawgroup.com		
4	William F Savino wsavino@woodsoviatt.com, lherald@woodsoviatt.com		
5	Kenneth John Shaffer johnshaffer@quinnemanuel.com		
6	Richard M Steingard , awong@steingardlaw.com		
7	Philip E Strok pstrok@swelawfirm.com, gcruz@swelawfirm.com;1garrett@swelawfirm.com;jchung@swelawfirm.com		
8	Boris Treyzon bt@treyzon.com, sgonzales@actslaw.com		
9	• United States Trustee (LA) ustpregion16.la.ecf@usdoj.gov		
10	• Eric D Winston ericwinston@quinnemanuel.com		
11	• Christopher K.S. Wong christopher.wong@arentfox.com, yvonne.li@arentfox.com		
12	Timothy J Yoo tjy@lnbyb.com		
13	Imouly of 100 typesmeyersem		
14	2. <u>SERVED BY UNITED STATES MAIL:</u>		
15	Debtor: Girardi Keese		
16	1126 Wilshire Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90017		
17	ABIR COHEN TREYZON SALO, LLP, a California limited liability partnership (ACTS)		
18	16001 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 200		
19	Encino, CA 91436		
20	Donlin, Recano & Company 6201 15th Ave		
21	Brooklyn NV 11210		
22	IDiscovery Solutions		
23	535 Anton Blvd Ste 850 Costa Mesa, CA 92626		
24	James W Spertus		
25	Spertus Landes & Umhoffer LLP 1990 South Bundy Dr Ste 705		
26			
27			
28			
	i		

Case	2:20-bk-21022-BR Doc 661 Filed 09/08/21 Entered 09/08/21 18:22:15 Desc Main Document Page 10 of 10
	ŭ
1	Neil Steiner
2	Steiner & Libo, Professional Corp 11845 W. Olympic Blvd Ste 910W
3	Los Angeles, CA 90064
4	Boris Treyzon Esq
5	16001 Ventura Blvd., Suite 200 Encino, CA 91436
6	Andrew W Zepeda
7	Lurie, Zepeda, Schmalz, Hogan & Martin 1875 Century Park East Ste 2100
8	Los Angeles, CA 90067
9	3. SERVED BY PERSONAL DELIVERY:
10	U.S. Bankruptcy Court:
11	U.S. Bankruptcy Court Hon. Barry Russell
12	255 E. Temple Street, Suite 1660 Los Angeles, CA 90012
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	-10-
	APPELLANT'S STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL IN BANKRUPTCY COURT